DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 074 068 SP 006 304

AUTHOR Larkin, Ralph W.
TITLE Social Exchange in the Elementary School Classroom: The Problem of Teacher Legitimation of Social Power.
NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Environment; Discipline; Elementary School Students; *Individual Power; *Leadership Styles; Power Structure; *Social Behavior; Social Environment; *Teacher Behavior

ABSTRACT

A study of teacher leadership styles and classroom climates in 75 elementary school classrooms showed that teacher task and expressive orientations powerfully influenced classroom morale. Teacher authoritarianism had no effect, calling into question interpretations of previous studies of teacher leadership. Teacher power orientation showed strong negative relationships to peer influences and peer group centrality. With classroom climates typed according to morale, peer influence, and peer group centrality, combinations of teacher leadership modes--based on task and expressive and power orientations--were strong influences on classroom climates. Teachers legitimated their power through satisfaction of task and socio-emotional needs of the students. Non-legitimation of power leads to alienated or rebellious classrooms. (A 14-item bibliography and appendixes of related research material are included.) (Author)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 074068

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SOCIAL EXCHANGE IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSROOM:

The Problem of Teacher Legitimation of Social Power

by

FEB 2 3 1973

Ralph W. Larkin

SP 006 304

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
105 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10016

SOCIAL EXCHANGE IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSROOM:

The Problem of Teacher Legitimation of Social Power

ABSTRACT

A study of teacher leadership styles and classroom climates in seventy-five elementary school classrooms showed that teacher task and expressive orientations powerfully influenced classroom morale. Teacher authoritarianism had no effect, calling into question interpretations of previous studies of teacher leadership. Teacher power orientation showed strong negative relationships to peer influences and peer group centrality. Typing classroom climates based on morale, peer influence, and peer group centrality, combinations of teacher leadership modes based on task, expressive, and power orientations were strong influences on classroom climates. Teachers letitimated their power through satisfaction of task and socio-emotional needs of the students. Non-legitimation of power leads to alienated or rebellious classrooms.

SOCIAL EXCHANGE IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSROOM:

The Problem of Teacher Legitimation of Social Power

The problem of legitimation of power has long been of concern to sociologists. Since the early work of Weber, sociological inquiry has been directed at identifying the sources of legitimation, modes of behavior which continue to undermine it, and its relation to the role of leadership. It comes as no surprise that people occupying roles of leadership in formal organizations are also concerned with legitimation of power.

In the field of education, legitimation has been the overwhelming concern of almost every teacher. There is a plethora of material available to the teacher giving hints and palliatives for the maintenance of "control" and "classroom discipline." The beginning elementary and secondary school teacher always seems to be the prime beneficiary of advice concerning the maintenance of classroom control. A collection of first year teachers' experiences was recently published with its title being one of the universal panaceas for keeping the students in tow: Don't Smile Until Christmas (Ryan, 1970).

The major problem of the teacher, or any other person in a formalized leadership position is to promote willing compliance with his directives. The rational-legal authority invested in the role of the teacher as a line officer is inimical to the production of willing compliance, since all rational-legal authority is based on the coercion of the law. As several scholars in the area have shown (cf. Simmel, 1955; Coser, 1956; and Blau, 1964) the use

of coercion leads to opposition rather than legitimation. Legitimation, by definition, is the ability of the leader to gain willing compliance of his charges.

As the bureaucratized structures of society take over greater sectors of human interaction, traditional authority is undermined. The appeal to the traditional authority based on adult-child roles is not of much use to teachers today as a way in which to legitimate power. The only mode left for a teacher to use to legitimate power is through professional authority to satisfy the needs of the client.

Leadership, Exchange, and Legitimation

Sociological inquiry into the dynamics of classroom interaction has been a long-standing concern. Since the early studies of Lippit and White (1960), many studies have been carried out using their conception of teacher leadership.[1] The democratic-authoritarian dimension of Lippit and White was an important jump in the conceptualization of teacher leadership in the classroom. Previously, the personality structures of teachers were the focal point of studies of classroom climates, yielding relatively unfruitful results (cf. Ryans, 1960; Heil, Powell, and Feifer, 1960). However, the authoritarian-democratic conceptualization was lacking in consistency and unidimensionality, as evidenced by the results of the laissez-faire leadership mode.[2] As a result, the studies using only authoritarian-democratic dimensions are of limited use in analyzing the dynamics of classroom social systems.

Clearly, the Lippit and White studies show that their typologies do not adequately answer the problem of legitimation. On the basis of their results, only the democratic teachers had legitimated the power inherent in their roles, while authoritarian (high power use) and laissez-faire (low power use) had not. Therefore, legitimation of power must be based on something other than the mere use or non-use of power. A major unstated finding of the democratic-authoritarian studies is that power does not legitimate itself. Contained in the dimensions of the authoritarian-democratic studies are the elements of legitimation. However, they are confused with the use of social power. The question arises, "How is social power legitimated?"

According to Blau (1967: 209)

> "Individual subordinates submit to the authority of the superior because group norms require them to do so and failure to conform evokes social disapproval. The individual exchanges compliance with the directives of the superior for social approval from his peers. The collectivity of subordinates, which it has to offer as the result of its social norms that enforce compliance, and which legitimates the superior's authority, for the contribution to the common welfare his leadership furnishes."

Thus, Blau infers that in the classroom, legitimation is dependent on the perceptions of the students. A student's peer group is the source of normative influence. If the peer group perceives the teacher working for the common good of the group, it will approve of conformity to the the teachers' directives. If it does not, peer approval will be given to those students who defy the teacher and reinforce the opposition ideology of the peer group.

In the classroom, the common welfare is assumed to be the student needs for competency, affiliation, guidance, and personal support. It is

hypothesized that teachers who satisfy task and/or socio-emotional needs of the students in their classrooms will have a great deal of authority in those classrooms. Teachers who do not satisfy either task or socio-emotional needs will not have legitimate power in the classroom, resulting in anomic or revolutionary classroom atmospheres.

Methodology

To test the exchange hypothesis, 1,750 elementary students in grades four, five, and six in the Southern California area were sampled. They were housed in seventy-five classrooms across thirteen schools in five school districts which varied in enrollment, community size, racial and ethnic characteristics of the student population, urbanization of the community, and social class of the community it served. Table 1 describes the characteristics of the thirteen schools.

Table 1 about here

The socio-economic status of the school was the mean of the occupational status of the families that attended the school. The Duncan Occupational Status Scale was used (Duncan, 1961). For our purposes, quintiles, rather than deciles, were used.

Teacher leadership dimensions were considered the independent variables of the study. Teacher leadership style was broken down into three dimensions to explore the effect of each dimension on legitimation. The three dimensions are: task orientation, expressive orientation, and power

orientation.

To assess the leadership style of each teacher, the students responded to fourteen items related to observed teacher behavior in the classroom. The fourteen items were Guttman scaled along the three dimensions of leadership.[3]

Task orientation indicates the amount of emphasis the teacher puts on "getting the job done." A high task oriented teacher is one who programs pupils' activities, provides immediate and detailed feedback, and checks to see that the pupils are learning the concepts that are being taught. Power orientation indicates the amount of decision-making that the teacher keeps to himself and how much he invests in the pupils. The expressiveness dimension indicates the warmth of the relationship between the teacher and his pupils. A high expressive teacher is one who has "good rapport" with his pupils.

A test of the interrelationships indicated that each dimension measured a separate construct. Task orientation and power orientation were independent of each other (G = .05, NS) as were power and expressive orientations (G = .12, NS). Task orientation and expressive orientation were positively related (G = .28, $<$ .01), but the strength of the relationship indicates that they are measuring separate dimensions.

Three variables were used to measure classroom climates. A morale score was computed from student responses to seven items related to their liking of school. The classroom mean scale score was used as the morale indicator. A four-point Likert-type response mode was used. An index of peer influence was also computed using the same methodology.[4] The sociometric question, "Who are your closest friends?" was asked to assess the

peer group structure in the classroom. The students were allowed seven choices. The mean number of choices per child was 5.77, with fifty-four percent of all choices occurring within the classroom. A centrality score was given each classroom by computing the standard deviation of the pupil status scores in the classroom. Thus, a classroom that has a highly centralized peer group structure would be one in which there are a small group of high status leaders, and a great many choices are directed toward them; whereas, a classroom that has a diffuse peer group structure is one where there is less differentiation between leaders and followers with the choices being spread fairly equally around the classroom.

Classroom Climates and Legitimation

By using these three criteria and dichotomizing each variable, eight classroom climates can be distinguished. Table 2 indicates the eight types. The peer dominated, acquiescent classroom is one in which the peer group has a strong influence over its members and the liking of school is high. The differentiated acquiescent classroom type is one in which there is a strong differentiation between high status and low status students, the peer group is a minor influence and the liking of school is high. The diffuse acquiescent class is one in which peer group influence is high and supportive of the school, and the peer group is democratized. The teacher-dominated acquiescent classroom is one in which the peer group has little influence over its members. Morale is high and classroom activities are seen as pleasureful. The rebellious type is one in which the peer group seems to have coalesced around an "opposition ideology" with the peer group

the dominating force in the classroom. The differentiated alienated classroom is potentially rebellious but the peer group has not ascended to domination. The diffuse alienated classroom is also potentially rebellious, but the peer group has not coalesced. The weak alienated classroom is one in which the peer group is of little direct influence, yet morale is low.

Table 2 about here

Of the eight types of classroom climates, clearly the rebellious classroom climate is one in which the power of the teacher has not been legitimated. The peer group seems to have coalesced around an anti-school ideology with strong influence patterns and a well-defined leadership structure. The alienated types are cases in which legitimation may be tenuous for various reasons. Legitimation, like most other sociological constructs, is not an all or nothing phenomenon. We are using legitimation as a global term; however, there are many subareas in which teachers have authority. Thus, we will classify the alienated classroom types as marginal.

Thus we can generate the following specific hypotheses:

(1) The higher the task orientation of the teacher, the higher the classroom morale.

(2) The higher the expressive orientation of the teacher, the higher the classroom morale.

(3) Teacher authoritarianism and classroom morale are unrelated.

(4) The higher the authoritarianism of the teacher, the greater the difficulty of legitimating his power.

(5) Teachers legitimate their power by satisfying task and expressive needs of their pupils.

Findings

Table 3 indicates the relationships between the three dimensions of teacher leadership and the three indicators of classroom climate. As hypothesized, the task and expressive dimensions are positively related to classroom morale, while authority is not. These findings give strong support to our theory of legitimation of power. When we look at the data, we find that use of power has very little to do with the morale of the pupils in the classroom. Authority seems to have been confounded with the use of social power, which, in many cases, may be perceived by the pupils in the classroom as illegitimate. It comes as no surprise that two different teachers can make the same demands on their students and one will receive eager and willing compliance while the other meets with strong resistance.

Table 3 about here

Table 3 indicates that in the development of a theory of legitimation, we are on the right track. The forcefulness of the findings of Table 3 are such that they indicate that though power orientation of the teacher is not important to classroom morale, it acts as a powerful suppressant on peer group influence. The higher the power orientation of the teacher, the less influence the peer group has and the more diffuse the peer group structure.

To test hypotheses four and five, the teacher leadership dimensions were trichotomized. For theoretical and practical reasons (see Gordon, et

al., 1963: 137-138) the task dimension was collapsed into two categories, (1) low, and (2) middle and high. This gives us an eighteen cell typology of teacher leadership modes which can be used to examine the interactive effects of the three dimensions. Each modal category was ranked on morale, peer influence, and peer group centrality. Those modes containing three or less classrooms were omitted from the analysis. Table 4 shows the rankings of each mode. By dichotomizeing the rankings into high and low on each climate dimension, used in the typology of classroom climates, we can classify the classroom climate for each of twelve leadership modes as shown in Table 5.

Table 4 about here

Table 5 about here

The four teacher leadership modes in which the teacher is high on power (Modes B, E, I, L) contain three climate types: rebellious, weak alienated, and teacher-dominated acquiescent. The teacher-dominated acquiescent classroom type occurs when the high power teacher is high expressive (Mode L). The weak alienated type occurs with low and middle expressive teacher styles (Modes E and I). The rebellious classroom occurs when high power is combined with low task and expressive orientations (Mode B). Middle power only appears in combination with middle-to-high task (Modes D, H,

K) with low task, middle power appearing as empty cells. Thus we only have three cells relating to middle power. Of those three types, middle and high expressive teachers have acquiescent classes (Modes H and K) and low expressive teachers seem to have rebellious classroom climates (Mode D). The low power-low task classrooms seem to foster anomic climates (Modes A and F). Among middle-to-high task oriented teachers we find all three low power types manifesting acquiescent classroom climates (Modes C, G, J), indicating that the power of the teacher has been legitimated, while for the middle power teacher types, it is only when the expressiveness of the teacher is middle or high that the pupil climates are acquiescent (Modes H and K). Finally, for high power teachers, only the high expressive teachers have acquiescent climates (Mode L). Therefore, the evidence indicates that for middle-to-high task oriented teachers, the higher the power orientation, the more difficult legitimation is. Thus we have partially validated the fourth hypothesis. The data is not available for the low task teacher types.

To examine hypothesis 5, let us begin by examining the influences of the low expressive teacher. Table 5 indicates that with the exception of the middle-to-high task, low power teacher type (Mode C), low expressive teachers are in trouble when legitimating their power (Modes A, B, D, E). Of the five available cells, four indicate legitimation problems. As a matter of fact, the other four types rank ninth, tenth, eleventh and twelfth in morale. (See Table 4). As indicated in Table 4, the difference between weak alienated and rebellious classroom types is the product of complex social processes. We find that the two rebellious classroom types have only low expressive teacher types in common (Modes B and D.) It is easy to see

that the low task, high authority, low expressive teacher (Mode B) would have a rebellious classroom climate. This teacher type is coercive and does not exchange satisfaction of task or expressive needs for dominance. Says Blau (1964: 228), "Subjugation by coercive force can hardly be experienced as just, for it offers no compensating advantages for submission. Hence coercion is virtually always resisted, and, if possible, actively opposed." The low task, high authority, low expressive teacher is a pure example of such a phenomenon, and is reflected as such in Table 4.

Another example of the rebellious classroom is the middle-to-high task, middle power, low expressive teacher type (Mode D). The interesting thing about this particular leadership mode is that it is juxtaposed between the low power teacher type (Mode C) in which classrooms are peer dominated, and the high power teacher in which there is low morale (Mode E). It seems that this particular type combines the worst of the two modes surrounding it. Apparently, the middle authority teacher does not use enough power to dominate the peer group as does the high authority teacher, nor is he able to create a situation of positive morale as does the low power teacher. This also seems to indicate that, at least in the elementary school, legitimation of power based on satisfaction of task needs is not sufficient to receive willing compliance. This teacher might be characterized as withdrawn from the students, concerned about achievement, but the task orientation is probably focused on drudge work in which there is little joy, and maybe inconsistent in the use of power. Since the power is not suppressive enough to stem the peer influence and the teacher is not expressive enough to legitimate the use of power, the pupils are able to coalesce around their dislike

of the teacher and subvert the goals of the classroom. It is conceivable that since we are using rather gross measures, Mode D classrooms may contain a good percentage of borderline rebellious classrooms as well as pure types.

Weak alienated classroom climates occur in two basic instances: first, when the teacher assumes a very passive leadership role (Modes A and F), and second, when the teacher assumes a strongly suppressive role (Modes E and I). Since Table 4 reveals that the more pure types occur when the teacher assumes a suppressive role, they will be considered first. There is little difference between classroom climates when the teacher assumes a middle-to-high task orientation in combination with high power and low or middle expressiveness (Modes E and I). In these classrooms, the morale is low, yet it seems as though the oppressive strength of the teacher is such that the peer group is rendered ineffective. As evidenced in Table 3, the teacher has tremendous power over the internal dynamics of the classroom. Thus, through such devices as maintenance of silence, seating arrangements, strong use of sanctions, heavy work orientation, such teachers seem to be able to maintain control over the potentially rebellious aspects of the classroom.

In the case of the low power teachers, the weak alienated peer group seems to be a response to a leadership vacuum. Mode A, and to a lesser extent Mode F, teachers seem to create climates in which morale is low yet the peer group has not responded in a rebellious way. Contrast, for example, the difference in climates between the low task, low authority, low expressive (Mode A) and the low task, high power, low expressive teacher

leadership styles (Mode B). On the one hand the peer group is fairly diffuse and peer influence is low; on the other, peer influence is high and the peer group is highly centralized. There seems to be an indication that when the teacher "isn't there," the students do not have anything against which to rebel. Blau states, "The (opposition) ideology activates opposition by legitimating it and intensifies the conflict by transforming it into an unselfish struggle against oppressors." (1964: 232). The problem with teachers who fall into such leadership modes is that they cannot be viewed by their students as oppressors. Since their needs are not being met, their morale is low. But at the same time, there is no power source against which to rebel, thus the peer group tends to be rendered impotent as a basis for coordinated effort.

Now we will examine the acquiescent classrooms. There are three aspects which stand out when examining the distribution of the acquiescent classroom types. Firstly, they are all in the middle-to-high task dimension. Secondly, as the expressiveness of the teacher type increases, the greater the probability of acquiescent classroom climates. Thirdly, in the middle-to-high task sector, all the low power classrooms have acquiescent classroom climates.

It is interesting to note that the particular styles which have acquiescent climates tend to cluster around so-called "democratic" styles of leadership, with the exception of the teacher who is high on all three dimensions. The prototype of the democratic teacher is the middle-to-high task oriented, low power, high expressive teacher (Mode J). Variations on this theme are those who are middle expressive and/or middle power

oriented (Modes G, H, K). This gives us four leadership types, and possibly a fifth, if the low expressive teacher type (Mode C) is included, which rank second, third, fourth, (fifth), and sixth in morale. This indicates the "democratic-authoritarian" studies came out with positive results in favor of the democratic teacher because power and expressiveness were confounded. However, consider the teacher leadership style which has the highest morale of them all (Mode L). The teacher who is high on all three dimensions has the highest morale of all twelve modes, which runs counter to previous studies. Thus, it isn't necessarily democracy that preadolescent students want; but rather their needs satisfied. The teacher who is high on all three dimensions might be dubbed, "Superteacher." He does everything and the children love him. In such a classroom, the peer group is weak and of little impact. The teacher is "authoritarian," yet the power he uses is legitimate because of his expressiveness and task centeredness. The interaction is directed through the teacher. Because of his dynamism, he becomes the focal point of the classroom interaction. Since the students become dependent on him for the satisfaction of their needs, their relationship with each other weakens, thus weakening the peer influence in general.

Though we cannot make much judgement about low task oriented teacher leadership styles, the data indicate that those teachers who satisfy task and socio-emotional needs of their students tend to have acquiescent classroom climates and tend to generate more willing compliance to their directives than do those teachers who do not satisfy the task and socio-emotional needs of their students.

Conclusions

We have viewed authority in the classroom as a result of social processes that bring about the legitimation of power. Though the legitimation of power has been of great concern to such sociologists of the Nineteenth Century as Durkheim, Weber, and to a lesser extent, Marx, the study of the legitimation process has not been given much thought in the empirical literature.

It is very difficult to study emergent processes in ongoing organizations because by the time it is studied, the legitimation process has already been completed. Schools offer a very fertile ground to study the legitimation process, because each September, teachers walk into the school with new students and the legitimation process begins anew. A teacher must legitimate the power he has in his role at the beginning of each year. That may be one of the reasons why teachers are so concerned with developing "rapport" and not smiling until Christmas.

The questions with which we began this paper concerned the role of authority in the classroom, how it is legitimated from power, and what effects the teacher role has on the classroom climate. Our findings indicate that authority is part of a larger social process in which students and teachers involve themselves. By and large, power is used to suppress the influence of the peer group. It seems to be an effective way to control peer influence patterns. However, it is also a technique that can backfire if the teacher mistakes authority with power and tries to use social power that has not been legitimated. In such cases, the teacher finds that

the situation has turned against him, and the students have risen up in rebellion. When teachers focus on power relationships as a mode of retaining control of the classroom, they find themselves in a situation in which opposition is generated, and must use more power to stem the rebellion, thus creating more opposition. Such classrooms are caught in a vicious circle of repression and rebellion, until some status quo is reached in which the students either take over the classroom or the teacher triumphs through the use of force--a Pyrrhic victory, to say the least.

As we have seen, power is one major aspect of the teacher role. The task and expressive orientations of the teacher are integral parts of the legitimation in the classroom. It is through the participation of the teacher in the formal (task) and informal (expressive) relationships in the classroom that exchange takes place. The withdrawal of the teacher from either or both sectors of the interaction reduces the possibility of exchange between teacher and pupil. When exchange is limited or nonexistent, legitimation becomes tenuous or nonexistent. When the teacher uses a great deal of power without the authority to do so, polarization occurs.

As the leader of a social system the teacher has a great deal of influence over the kinds of interaction that take place. By virtue of his role as teacher and adult, he is invested with various sanctioning powers to control the behavior in the classroom. Because they are students and children, pupils are expected to follow their adult leaders. However, once in the classroom, the force of face-to-face interaction creates various social climates, some satisfying to the participants, some very unsatisfying, depending primarily on the type of leadership offered.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Other studies using similar conceptualizations of teacher leadership are Anderson, H. H., Brewer, J. E., and Freeman, F. N., "Studies of Teachers' Classroom Personalities, II." Applied Psychology Monographs No. 8 Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1946; Flanders, N.A., "Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes, and Achievement." Cooperative Research Monograph No. 12. Washington: U.S. Printing Office, 1965; and Herman, W. L., Potterfield, J. E., Dayton, C. M., and Amerchek, K. G., "The Relationship of Teacher-Centered Activities and Pupil-Centered Activities to Pupil Achievement and Interest in 18 Fifth Grade Social Studies Classes," American Educational Research Journal 6 227-240.

[2]Lippit and White found that students reacted similarly to the laissez-faire leadership type and the authoritarian leadership type. Though productivity was higher in the authoritarian setting, morale and aggressive behavior were more apparent in these types than in the democratic teacher type. For explanation in further detail, see White, R. K., and Lippit, R., Autocracy and Democracy. New York, Harper and Row, 1960.

[3]The coefficients of reproducibility and scalability for each dimension is as follows: Task Orientation, CR=.91, CS=.64; Authority Orientation, CR=.93, CS=.73; Expressive Orientation, CR=.94, CS=.75. The items in each dimension are: Task. (1) Are you given new work in arithmetic before you are able to get the right answers to the old work? (2) Does this

Footnotes
Continued

teacher go over a day's work with you again before going on to the next lesson, or do you go on without reviewing? (3) What does this teacher most often do when he is teaching the class something new and the pupils don't understand? (4) How often are you required to show the teacher (by writing or telling the answer to a question or a problem) that you understand what is being taught? Authority. (1) When the teacher has made up his mind about something, has he ever changed it when the pupils objected? (2) How often would you say this teacher has changed assignments this year because the pupils objected to them? (3) After you know what you are going to do in this class, who usually decides how you are going to do it? (4) When the class starts a new social studies unit, who plans how you will do the work? Expressive. (1) Does this teacher show that he wants to make the work interesting for the pupils or does he not? (2) Does the teacher ask you questions in a way which makes you nervous and uncomfortable about answering them, or does he ask you questions in a kind way? (3) Does this teacher try to make the class enjoyable for the pupils or not? (4) Does this teacher show that he likes pupils in this class or not? (5) Is this teacher usually fair or usually unfair when he decides things about pupils? (6) Does this teacher show that he will help you with school work and also help you with anything else you would like to talk to him about? The response modes for each item were three to five statements related to the extent to which the teacher exhibited the behavior indicated in the stem.

Footnotes
Continued

[4]The items relating to morale were: (1) I usually enjoy my classwork here at school. (2) Most teachers are nice people. (3) I think of school as an enjoyable place. (4) I always like school. (5) Much of what goes on at school is dull and boring. (6) This school has many good teachers. (7) I enjoy school days more than holidays and weekends. Summed scale scores were used. Reliability was checked with coefficient alpha=.68. The peer influence scale had a coefficient alpha of .52. The items were: (1) My friends are the most important people in my life. (2) I wouldn't mind being thought of as an "odd ball" by my friends. (3) Sometimes I do silly things just so my frieds will pay attention to me. (4) Even when my friends break the rules, I won't. (5) I sometimes do things that are wrong because I see my friends doing them. (6) If I disagree with what my friends say, I would keep quiet. (7) I do some things just to make my friends think well of me. (8) I feel upset if the group doesn't approve of me.

REFERENCES

Anderson, H.H., Brewer, J.E., and Freeman, F.N. "Studies of Teachers' Classroom Personalities, II." Applied Psychology Monographs No. 8. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1946.

Blau, P.M. Exchange and Power in Social Life. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Coser, L.A. The Functions of Social Conflict. New York: The Free Press, 1956.

Duncan, O.D. "A Socio-economic Index for all Occupations," in Albert Reiss, Jr., et al., Occupations and Social Status. New York: The Free Press, 1961.

Flanders, N.A. "Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes, and Achievement." Cooperative Research Monograph No. 12. Washington: U.S. Printing Office, 1965.

Gordon, C.W., Adler, L.A., and McNeil, J.D. "Dimensions of Teacher Leadership in Classroom Social Systems." University of California, Los Angeles, 1963.

Heil, L.M., Powell, M., and Feifer, I. "Characteristics of Teacher Behavior and Competency Related to the Different Kinds of Children in Several Elementary Grades." U.S. Office of Education, 1960.

Herman, W.L., Potterfield, J.E., Dayton, C.M., and Amerchek, K.G. "The Relationship of Teacher-Centered Activities and Pupil-Centered Activities to Pupil Achievement and Interest in 18 Fifth Grade Social Studies Classes," American Educational Research Journal, 6: 227-240, 1969.

Larkin, R.W. "The Effects of Neighborhood and Organizational Contexts on Attitudes and Peer Group Structures of Preadolescents." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1970.

Ryan, K. Don't Smile Until Christmas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Ryans, D.G. Characteristics of Teachers. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.

Simmel, G. Conflict. Trans. Kurt Wolff. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955.

Walberg, H.J. "Predicting Class Learning: An Approach to the Class as a Social System," American Educational Research Journal, 6: 529-542, 1969.

White, R.K., and Lippit, R. Autocracy and Democracy. New York: Harper, 1960.

TABLE 1: CHARACTERISTICS OF THE THIRTEEN PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

School Number	Mean Occupational Status (5 point scale)	Size Enrollment	Community Size*	Percent White	Percent Black	Percent Mexican American	Percent Oriental
1	3.49	577	Small	15	0	82	0
2	1.60	652	Small	6	0	92	2
3	2.92	529	Small	18	0	81	1
4	2.11	995	Medium	1	84	14	0
5	3.39	822	Medium	90	1	8	1
6	3.61	728	Medium	92	0	7	1
7	3.53	500	Medium	96	0	4	0
8	3.20	762	Medium	93	1	6	0
9	3.28	600	Medium	82	0	5	12
10	2.97	1,255	Large	90	0	8	2
11	2.72	777	Large	35	42	21	2
12	2.53	1,299	Large	26	42	31	1
13	2.92	1,059	Large	86	0	13	1

*Small = Under 15,000
Medium = 15,000 - 100,000
Large = Over 100,000

TABLE 2: TYPOLOGY OF CLASSROOM CLIMATES

		PEER GROUP CENTRALITY			
		HIGH		LOW	
PEER INFLUENCE		HIGH	LOW	HIGH	LOW
MORALE	HIGH	PEER DOMINATED ACQUIESCENT	DIFFER-ENTIATED ACQUIESCENT	DIFFUSE ACQUIESCENT	TEACHER DOMINATED ACQUIESCENT
	LOW	REBELLIOUS	DIFFER-ENTIATED ALIENATED	DIFFUSE ALIENATED	WEAK ALIENATED

TABLE 3: MONOTONIC RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TEACHER LEADERSHIP DIMENSIONS AND CLASSROOM CLIMATE DIMENSIONS

		TEACHER LEADERSHIP DIMENSION		
		Task	Power	Expressive
CLASSROOM CLIMATE DIMENSIONS	Morale	.64**	.05	.80**
	Peer Influence	.00	-.57**	-.23**
	Peer Group Centrality	-.18*	-.58**	.07

*p < .05

**p < .01

TABLE 4: RANKINGS OF TEACHER LEADERSHIP MODES ON MORALE, PEER INFLUENCE, AND PEER GROUP CENTRALITY

TASK	Low			Middle-to-High		
POWER	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High
EXPRESSIVE						
Low						
Morale	11	--	12	5	10	9
Peer Influence	10	--		2	1	12
Peer Group Centrality	7	--	4	1	3	10
N	6	3	5	5	6	6
	Mode A		Mode B	Mode C	Mode D	Mode E
Middle						
Morale	7	--	--	4	6	8
Peer Influence	7	--	--	5.5	8	9
Peer Group Centrality	8	--	--	6	5	12
N	4	2	2	8	5	5
	Mode F			Mode G	Mode H	Mode I
High						
Morale	--	--	--	3	2	1
Peer Influence	--	--	--	3	5.5	
Peer Group Centrality	--	--	--	9	4	11
N	2	1	1	4	4	7
				Mode J	Mode K	Mode L

TABLE 5: TYPOLOGY OF TEACHER LEADERSHIP MODES AND CLASSROOM CLIMATES

		TASK					
		Low			Middle-to-High		
	POWER	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High
EXPRESSIVE	Low	Weak Alienated	--	Rebellious	Peer Dominated Acquiescent	Rebellious	Weak Alienated
	N	6	3	5	5	6	6
	Mode	A		B	C	D	E
	Middle	Weak Alienated	--	--	Peer Dominated Acquiescent	Differentiated Acquiescent	Weak Alienated
	N	4	2	2	8	5	5
	Mode	F			G	H	I
	High	--	--	--	Differentiated Acquiescent	Peer Dominated Acquiescent	Teacher Dominated Acquiescent
	N	2		1	4	4	7
	Mode				J	K	L